

Minnesota. According to tribal leaders who attended the meeting, “[t]here wasn’t much discussion on gaming except that when asked about the Wisconsin Dog Track issue the Area [Director’s] response was that the tribes had not submitted much information to her.”⁹²

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe (MCT) also sent the MAO a resolution opposing the application in January 1994.⁹³ This resolution expressed two objections to the Hudson proposal: first, that the member reservations “feel that a number of their tribal gaming operations will be economically impacted by this proposed action”; and second, that the member reservations “also feel that the approval of this application would set a dangerous precedent creating an open market for expansion by other reservations onto off-reservation fee lands for gaming purposes.”⁹⁴ The resolution was attached to a Jan. 28, 1994, letter addressed to Babbitt and copied to the MAO. The letter to Babbitt asserted that the “most significant” reason the MCT opposed the Hudson proposal was that the Minnesota tribes “have promised not to expand gaming off-reservation.” The MCT supplied no market impact data or study with the letter to support its assertion that the MCT reservations – none of which are located in close proximity to Hudson – would be “economically impacted” by a casino at that site.

Several individual tribes within the MCT also sent comments opposing the application. In February 1994, the Leech Lake Tribe sent their own resolution to Babbitt opposing the Hudson application and provided a copy to the MAO. Their cover letter noted their decision not to seek

⁹²MIGA Meeting Minutes, Dec. 19, 1994.

⁹³The six member tribes of the MCT are the Mille Lacs, White Earth, Bois Forte, Grand Portage, Leech Lake, and Fond Du Lac.

⁹⁴Minnesota Chippewa Tribe Resolution 143-94, Jan. 27, 1994.